

A

DEFENCE

Of the LETTER to

Dr *LOBB*, &c.

DO NOT WRITE

ONE LETTER

DE 10-8-80

1171. R. 11 J. S. C.
3

A

DEFENCE

Of the LETTER to

Dr L O B B, (7) H

CONCERNING

His Writings in PHYSIC.

WITH

An ANSWER to the Doctor's CHARGE,
against the AUTHOR, of aspersing the
Memory of Dr *Boerhaave*.

SUBMITTED

To the Judgment, not only of the ROYAL
SOCIETY, to whom the Doctor dedicates
his REPLY, but also of the COLLEGE of
PHYSICIANS.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, at the *Oxford-Arms*
in *Warwick-Lane*. 1753.

[Price One Shilling.]

DEFENCE

OF THE

ART OF

CONSTRUCTION

OF THE



SUBMITTED

To the Trustees, for only of the Museum
Society, to whom the British Museum
has been, but also of the Trustees of
the Trustees.

LONDON

Printed for J. Royston, at the Office
in Strand Lane, 1793.

[Price One Shilling.]

A

D E F E N C E

O F A

LETTER to Dr *LOBB*, &c.

DR Lobb having published some notions in Physic, particularly with regard to evacuations, which he endeavours to make the standard of all medical Practice; which he recommends to those of his readers, who are to prescribe for others, as the rule of their conduct, and to the rest of his readers, (whose patients soever they may happen to be) as the measure of their compliance with the advice given them; I apprehended such notions might be of dangerous consequence, so far as they are read and embraced, and therefore thought I might do some service to the public, by taking notice of them, and cautioning his readers how they received and applied them. With this view I published in September last, a Letter to Dr Lobb, concerning his Writings in Physic. Containing Remarks upon some of his peculiar notions, about Bleeding, Purging, &c. With a Postscript, on the

B manner

manner of writing Cases of particular Patients. To this letter the Doctor was pleased to reply about the end of March; and I have now undertaken to defend it, freely submitting the decision of the controversy to all able and impartial judges. The Doctor and I both profess the same intention in writing, namely, the good of mankind. I have told him my motives in his own words, both in the beginning, and at the conclusion of my letter: and I hope an anonymous writer, who has studiously endeavoured to conceal his name, cannot be suspected of having any private views of his own to serve. But though we agree in design, we happen to differ considerably in our opinions, about the means to obtain it. The Doctor is afraid men should be killed, or hurt, by bleeding and other evacuations. I allow that this may easily happen, under the direction of unskilful and incautious persons; but then, I am also afraid that men should die, or suffer greatly, for want of evacuations. The Doctor insists upon it, that bleeding, purging, &c. are improper, unless the quantity of fluids is too great, that is, *above the standard of Health*. I say, that it is difficult to ascertain this standard, or to prove that any precise one is necessary to health; as also to judge, in many cases, whether the quantity of fluids is equal to, or above, or below any supposed standard of health; and likewise that it may be proper, and sometimes necessary, to make evacuations, when there is no reason to think of any excess in the quantity of fluids. Who is most in the right, the Doctor or I, is not for him or me, but for others to determine.

The Doctor professes to write for *the ignorant*, and *for the use of families*: and his manner

ner of writing seems calculated to influence and captivate such readers. The number of his books, and the very important air with which they are written, must doubtless make him appear, in their eyes, as a very considerable author; especially as he assures them, that his doctrines are of the greatest consequence; that they are *founded on facts, supported by reason, and confirmed by experience*; and likewise informs them, that some of his books have had the approbation of learned men, of Boerhaave, of Sir Hans Sloane, and of the Royal Society. And, to make the impression on their minds yet stronger, and confirm them the more in a high opinion of his knowledge and skill in Physic, he is continually telling them how remarkably the *divine blessing* has attended his practice, and that he has *met with a long and happy series of successes*: he also lets them know, that he has *prayed* a great deal *to be directed and assisted in his studies*, and vouches for it, that his *prayers* have been *answered*; and, moreover, seems strongly to insinuate, that he has even had *secrets revealed* to him *from the God of heaven*.

To some of these readers it may seem a very bold undertaking, to write against such an author as this. But if they have *common sense*, (which the Doctor supposes necessary to understand his writings) and are able so far to divest themselves of prejudice, as to read my letter and this defence with attention, and can have leave from the Doctor to read them; I hope, at least, they will be convinced, that it is not unreasonable to examine such extraordinary pretensions as the Doctor's, and that they will not

think me impertinent in proposing cautions about some of his particular opinions.

Those indeed who think the Doctor's writings perfect, and that, by reading them, they themselves have acquired *right notions of diseases, and of the means proper for the cure of them, and of the errors which should be avoided*, so as to be able to know, *when bleeding, vomiting, purging, sweating, blistering, &c. ought, and ought not to be advised*, and whether the advice given about these evacuations, by other practitioners, be right or wrong, and ought, or ought not to be complied with ; (all which the Doctor proposes to teach, even in a pamphlet) those, I say, will doubtless think it superfluous and idle, to read any thing that I, or any body else, can write against the Doctor. And indeed it is evident, that if these persons have been made thus wise by the Doctor, at least in the article of evacuations, they will have no occasion to consult either him, or any body else on that head. For, if they know when evacuations ought, and ought not to be advised, and in what quantity, what can the Doctor himself know more about them ? This important part of medical knowledge being obtained, all the advice that such readers of the Doctor's stand in need of, is about *alterants* and *restoratives*, those two other *classes* of the Doctor's *medical instruments*. And if the Doctor shall think fit to publish one or two pamphlets, on these subjects, and can convey such clear ideas of them, that his readers may be able to know, when, and in what manner, the several sorts of these remedies are to be used with success, according to the different *morbid qualities* of the *fluids* which want to be corrected, or according to the kind of fluid that

is *deficient*, and to the degree of that deficiency; (which surely is as easy to do, as to shew, in all cases, when the several evacuations *ought*, and *ought not to be advised*) then every attentive reader of the Doctor's may commence Physician to himself, or to his family and neighbours. And, as all people will, without question, become his readers, there will be an end of the profession of Physic, as a mysterious art, practised by a particular set of men. The secrets being all laid open, and one standard of practice being established, every man's knowledge will be equal, who is capable of making himself master of the Doctor's rules. For my own part, (I speak it with great truth) I shall most freely resign my share of practice, for the sake of so general a good: and I doubt not but the rest of my brethren will have the like humane disposition. The Doctor himself will be abundantly provided for, as indeed he ought to be, since he will acquire riches enough by the sale of his books: and, which is of much more value, he will be secure of immortal fame, as author of the standard of universal practice, and Physician-General to the whole world. And surely he will enjoy all his honour and advantage without envy, as no reward can be too great for such merit.

I proposed, in my letter, only to take notice of some of the Doctor's more particular and remarkable notions, not to write an answer to all his numerous volumes. Therefore, the Doctor should not conclude, (as he seems too ready to do, both in his controversy with the authors of the Monthly Review, and with me) that all the rest of his doctrine is right and unexceptionable, which has been suffered to pass
without

without any remarks. In that letter I was not confined to any method, being to make such remarks as I thought proper, on any, or on all the Doctor's writings. Accordingly, in treating any particular argument, I referred to one or more of the Doctor's books, where I found any thing to my purpose. But, as the Doctor has written his reply on a methodical plan, dividing it into chapters as he thought fit, I shall follow him in that order he has been pleased to fix upon.

The first chapter then, after the introduction, is a defence of his pamphlet, called Medical Principles and Cautions: which chapter is again subdivided into other chapters, about some of the evacuations, mentioned in that pamphlet, which I had made remarks upon.

This pamphlet, on medical principles and cautions, (which, though last published, the Doctor chooses to put first) is a favourite piece of the Doctor's, which he seems to be as fond of, as some men are of a child of their old age. He speaks of it as of the utmost importance, wishes that all *medical advisers*^a would regulate *their advices* according to his principles and cautions; says, that this would be very happy for sick people, would be an effectual means of saving more lives, than the discovery of the *b* longitude (if obtained) possibly could be: that those who act contrary to them, do more or less injure^c their patients: that he hopes none of them are mistaken^d rules of practice, even after some of them had been controverted by the authors of the Monthly Review; and, in his reply to me, says, they

^a Sect. 455.

^b Sect. 195.

^c Sect. 425.

^d Ibid.

will bear the strictest examination, and the more they are examined, the brighter they will appear. The Doctor talks of his principles, as *fundamental* ones in the practice of Physic, and that these, with his cautions about evacuations, and his account of diseases, as contained in this pamphlet, are to teach a man *right notions of diseases, and of the means proper for the cure of them, and of the errors which should be^e avoided,* and to *shew when evacuations ought, and ought not to be^f advised.* One would expect, that all these pompous expressions belonged to something very extraordinary, to some new rules of practice which were clear and demonstrative, to some new discoveries, which were the fruit of long and well digested thoughts, ripened to perfection by age and experience. But how will these expectations be disappointed, when it appears, that this famous piece, so much boasted of, contains no new discoveries of the Doctor's, but consists chiefly, if not wholly, of doctrines and precepts extracted from his former works, retailed out under a new form and title; that it contains nothing new in Physic, but such peculiar notions of the Doctor's as will not easily be granted, or his singular method of telling what every body knew before. What instruction can ignorant readers receive, from such a short and general account of the *causes and cure of diseases*, as only tells, that all diseases proceed either from an *excess*, or from a *deficiency*, or a *wrong quality* in some of the animal fluids, or else from a *combination* of these *causes*; and, therefore, that the cure must be

^e Sect 2, 3, 4, and 201.
part, *i. e.* of the defence against me.

^f Title page of 3d

accomplished,

accomplished, either by *evacuations*, or *alteratives*, or *restoratives*, or by *compounding* these remedies *in such a manner as may remove those combined causes*? How much wiser does such an account make any man, than this still more general proposition, that all diseases are owing to something amiss in the body, and that the way to cure them, is to remove or correct whatever is amiss? Should not the Doctor have told the *signs*, which he says there are, to shew when there is an *excess* or *deficiency in the animal fluids*, in the *blood*, the *lymph*, and the *nervous fluid*; or when there is a *morbid quality* in them, and of what sort it is; since, without being acquainted with these signs; he grants it cannot be known, when, and what sort of *evacuations* should be made, nor when to give *alteratives*, or of what sort? And I suppose the Doctor means, (though he has omitted to say it expressly) that without being acquainted with the *signs* of deficiency, we cannot know how to direct *restoratives* properly. How then is it possible for any reader to learn from this pamphlet, (and yet the Doctor proposes to teach it) when *evacuations* ought, and ought not to be advised, as the *signs*, by which an excess in the quantity of fluids is to be known, are not declared, and as *evacuations* are not to be made, according to the Doctor, but upon account of such excess? Of what use are the Doctor's famous medical principles, about the excess, or deficiency, or morbid quality of the animal fluids, unless he taught his readers, how to know when there is an excess, or deficiency, or morbid quality in any of these fluids, and of what sort and degree it is? What is there in these principles, which the Doctor calls *fundamental*

mental ^s, more than in his general account of curing diseases above-mentioned, except that he makes three propositions or principles, one for each of the three fluids which he specifies, namely, the blood, the lymph, and the nervous fluid; and that he adds two negative principles, absolutely forbidding to make evacuations of blood or lymph, when there is no excess in those fluids? Of these principles, about which the Doctor makes such a pother, some are indeed very clear and evident, even so clear as not to convey any knowledge, which is often the case of propositions that are too general or self-evident; and some of them, (although *fundamental*) cannot be admitted as principles, without being further explained and limited. And as to his medical cautions, most of them need further cautions about understanding them, before they ought to be received as rules of practice. Some few of them are very plain, such as every body knows, and will agree to; so plain indeed, that I think hardly any one needs to be told them, who is capable of understanding the very terms of them; some of them are not to be allowed at all, and the rest not without great limitations. What the Doctor says about fevers, the small-pox, plague, &c. are brief abstracts of some of his notions in his books on those subjects, and some things to set forth the merit of those books, and of his lectures. In short, the pamphlet treats of things in so very general and concise a manner, that it seems better calculated as an advertisement, by way of recommending his larger works, and of invit-

^s These principles, which the Doctor makes but seven of here, he has in his Compendium, subdivided, and made them eleven.

ing pupils to attend his lectures, than to afford any real instruction to his readers. And thus much I think sufficient to say about this pamphlet, besides what I have said in my letter, and shall have occasion further to say in this defence, concerning some particular evacuations, which I now come to.

The first of these evacuations is bleeding. Of this I have spoken pretty largely in my letter, and am so far from desiring to repeat any thing I have there said, that I shall endeavour to be as brief as may be in what I have to add on this subject. The first thing I shall observe is, that the Doctor, in his reply to me, seems directly to contradict one of his *fundamental* principles. That principle is his fourth, which runs thus, *That in diseases, when the quantity of the blood is not greater than it ought to be, the taking blood from the patient should not be advised.* And in his reply, Sect. 484, he says, *I grant that in some distempers, attended with some symptoms, blood may moderately be taken from the patient, once or twice, although there is no excess in the quantity of it.* Let the Doctor reconcile these propositions, and justify his *fundamental* ^a principle. I presume the Doctor will say, that his principle is a general one. But a principle ought to be so general, and so true, as not to be liable to any exception. Whereas, the Doctor seems to think himself at liberty, to

^a In like manner, though the Doctor's first Principle asserts, *that when the quantity of the blood is too great, so much blood should be taken from the patient as may reduce it to the standard of health:* yet he says, in a note to sect. 909. *I apprehend that in the beginning of pestilential and other putrid fevers, bleeding the sick is not safe, even though they should have too much blood.*

lay down what he calls general principles and cautions; and at any time afterwards, if he is questioned about them, to explain them by such exceptions and restrictions as he pleases. The Doctor says, that I *do not seem clearly to distinguish between the different state of sick people, as to the quantity of their blood.* I suppose he means by this, that I do not speak just in his way, and continually mention his three *classes* of patients in his very words; that is to say, those *who have too much blood*, those *who have no more than a state of health requires*, and those *who have too little blood.* I should be glad always to have this distinction in view, if I knew any certain rules to determine it with exactness: and I think I have spoken with a sufficient regard to such a distinction, (and I hope intelligibly enough too) in what I have said on this subject in my letter, though not in the Doctor's very words. I will now be bold enough to assert, that it is right to take away blood, with prudence and due caution, from patients of the two last classes, (for of the first there can be no dispute between us) whenever cases occur, in which it is a lesser evil to bleed, than to omit it; and that such cases do sometimes occur, even in patients who manifestly have too little ^h blood.

^h I know not that it is incumbent on me (nor understand what the Doctor means when he says I ought) to *prove, that as a general rule, bleeding, and repeated bleeding, may be safe and necessary for those sick people, who have too little blood, or no more than a state of health requires; and especially when their diseases may be cured without this evacuation.* But would not the Doctor himself allow, that, if by taking 3 or 4 ounces of blood from a person under an hæmorrhage, (who, from the quantity lost, appears plainly to have too little left) we can make a revulsion, and so prevent the effusion of a much larger quantity, it would be right, in this case, to bleed a person who has *too little blood?*

At the same time it is evident, from what I have said in my letter, that I am as much against bleeding all patients indiscriminately, as the Doctor can possibly be. I have allowed that great mischief may be, and often has been, done by bleeding, when directed by ignorant persons, without due regard to cases and constitutions; that it is very wrong and pernicious, to order it alike in fevers of all the different kinds, and in all the stages of fevers without distinction; and for all women with child, in the same manner, let their constitutions and circumstances be ever so different. The great difference between the Doctor and me is, that I am for bleeding in some cases, where he will not admit of it at all; and that, in the beginning of some inflammatory fevers, (and perhaps too in some other diseases) I am for bleeding more largely, than ever the Doctor thinks right or necessary. I say, in the beginning of these fevers, which is the time for bleeding; for when it is too late in the case, the Doctor cannot express a greater dislike of it than I have done. He says, all our arguments from experience, about the success of large and repeated bleedings, are nothing against him, unless we prove that the patients were such as had either *too little blood*, or, at most, *not more than a state of health requires*. The only way I can think of, to settle this point with the Doctor, is, to take a case, where we bleed with success so largely, as that the Doctor cannot suppose, there could be so much blood to spare, so much more than a state of health requires. Let the example be a pleurisy: in which we bleed sometimes to forty or fifty ounces, or more, as the constitution and circumstances seem to us to require. Can the Doctor suppose, that any of our patients

tients ever have so great a plethora, as to require such an evacuation as this, when the Doctor himself *never ordered bleeding more than twice, nor took away more than twenty ounces in all, from any one person in this distemper, though he wasⁱ young?* Must not the Doctor think, that, in some of these cases at least, we repeat bleeding after the patients have *too little blood*, according to his reckoning? And, if so, I hope the Doctor will admit, that our arguments from success do concern him, and that he ought to pay as much regard to our experience, as he expects we should do to his. The Doctor tells me, the point of febrile rarefaction has been considered already, Sect. 253, to 258. that is, in his reply to the authors of the Monthly Review. But how has this point been considered there? The Doctor says, he knows how to remove the rarefaction of the blood in fevers, *without rendering a too little quantity of it still less by phlebotomy*: and that he should think his knowledge very defective, if he was not acquainted with medicines proper, and effectual for the cure of such patients, *without bleeding^k them*: for the proof of which, he refers to the histories of cases, in his books, on the small-pox, and on fevers. I shall readily grant, that we ought to be very careful how we bleed patients, when it is doubtful whether they can bear the loss of any blood or not: and that perhaps there is not a more difficult point, which occurs in practice, to most wise and considerate Physicians, than to determine, in some cases, whether they ought to proceed any further in bleeding or not; whether the consequences of repeating, or of omit-

ⁱ Lobb's Medical Practice, sect. 511.
Princ. and Cant. sect. 256, 257.

^k Medic.

ting it, are likely to be the most dangerous to the patients. All that they can do, in such a situation, is, to ballance the circumstances of the cases, with all the exactness and circumspection they possibly can, and to resolve on that side of the question, where, upon the whole, there appears to be the least evil, or the greatest probability of assisting the patients. But if the question be, whether any blood should be taken away or not, only because a man has not more blood than he usually has in a state of health, (if that could always be known) I think no practitioner of judgment and experience, except Dr Lobb, will long hesitate about it, when the symptoms seem to him to require bleeding; at least not till the Doctor has proved, that a certain determinate quantity of blood is necessary to every man, in order to his being in health, or made it evident, by further and clearer histories of fevers, than those he has hitherto published, that all febrile rarefactions can be cured without bleeding. The former of these the Doctor has endeavoured to illustrate, rather than prove, by supposing the case of a vessel, which is necessary for some use to be kept full of water to a certain ¹ point, and in a certain degree of heat; but by some adventitious heat, the water is much rarefied, and raised above it's point. In this case, says the Doctor, if I draw off part of the water, the supposed use of the vessel will be destroyed after the rarefaction ceases; but, if I can by other means remove the rarefaction, without lessening the quantity of water, the vessel may remain in it's proper use. Here the Doctor ought to have considered, that

¹ See the note to sect. 503. of the Doctor's reply to me.

the making this supposition, and applying it by way of simile to the human body, is begging the question. It is taking for granted, that a certain quantity of blood and other fluids in the body is necessary, and that it cannot bear a variation, one way or the other, without a diminution of health; which the Doctor has nowhere proved, though I have called upon him to do it: and I think I have sufficiently proved the contrary, in my letter, by indisputable facts, though the Doctor has not thought fit to take any notice of them. I will only beg leave to make a supposition in my turn, about this supposed case; which is, that the Doctor may possibly fail of removing the rarefaction by his other means, and that, while he is trying them, either the vessel may burst, or the water run over, and five times the quantity of it be lost, that was necessary to have been drawn off, in order to prevent the ill consequences of the rarefaction. If either of these should happen, what becomes of the use of the vessel? And would it not have been better, to lessen the quantity of water in the vessel, by drawing off to a certain degree, than to lose a much greater quantity, or the whole of it together with the vessel; and especially if there were any means of supplying the quantity of water so drawn off, as there is of recruiting the fluids of an animal body? Nor do his histories of particular patients under fevers by any means prove, that all febrile rarefactions of the blood may be removed without bleeding, though the Doctor appeals to them as evidence of it. And indeed how is it possible, that any number of cases, which have happened, can be a proof for all which may happen? In some of these histories it appears, that the patients were bled by
other

other people, before they came under the Doctor's care: in one case the Doctor thought fit to order a repetition of bleeding, not because there was too much blood, but *to make a revulsion from the obstructed vessels, and as a lesser evil to avoid a greater*; a liberty which the Doctor may take himself, though he seems very unwilling to trust any body else with it: and in one case, a pleurisy, the Doctor cannot tell whether the patient was bloodedⁿ or not. These cases, therefore, I think, are no evidence of the Doctor's assertion. There are some of the Doctor's histories related in such a superficial manner, that it is impossible for any other Physician to determine by the account, whether he should have ordered bleeding or not, if the patients had been under his care. And there are a very large number of these histories, in which no Physician would have thought of bleeding, any more than the Doctor did. Let then any judicious reader determine, how far the few remaining histories (if there are any such) are a proof to the Doctor's purpose, that the rarefaction of the blood in fevers may be removed without bleeding, in all cases where there is no excess in the quantity of blood.

The next evacuation mentioned by the Doctor is vomiting. But I shall add nothing more on this subject, till the Doctor answers what I have said in my letter, and tells us, what those *more gentle medicines are*, by which *the advantages obtained by vomiting, may as effectually be obtained without it*. The Doctor says, I have not *spoken to any of his four cautions about vomiting, nor the reasons assigned for them*. It is true, I have not, nor did I intend to speak to

^m 2 Vol. on fevers, p. 326.

ⁿ Ibid. Hist. 49.

them,

them, as I was not writing a voluminous answer to every thing the Doctor had written. However, if the Doctor is desirous to know my opinion about them, I tell him very freely, that not one of those cautions is fit to be received as a rule of practice, without being further explained and limited: and that as the ignorant readers, for whom the Doctor writes, are not capable, either of understanding them well, or of making the necessary distinctions, these cautions can be of little or no use to them, but may possibly be the occasion of dangerous mistakes.

Another evacuation, controverted between the Doctor and me, is purging. And as to this, I am willing to refer my readers to what I have said in my letter, and to what the Doctor has written on this subject, and leave them to judge between us: and shall only observe two or three things the Doctor has said, in his reply to me. The first is, that when I urge against the Doctor, the absolute words of his third caution, *not to prescribe purging medicines in the beginning of fevers, or before their declination*; he answers, that he means only the rough stimulating purges, not those of the gentle lenient kind, which will raise no disturbance in the body. This is another instance of the Doctor's taking a liberty, to explain a positive general assertion

◦ The Doctor has admitted some limitation to his first and second cautions, in his answer to the Review. He has also, in his Rational Methods, p. 335, spoken of Vomits in the Dropsy Ascites, so as to clash with his first and third cautions. And I am persuaded, that cases might easily be put, which not only other Physicians, but even the Doctor himself would allow to be exceptions to every particular of all his four cautions. The like exceptions may be made to most of the Doctor's general cautions about other evacuations.

of his own in as restrained a sense as he pleases. If the Doctor had said this at first, he had prevented my objection. But, are not Manna, Cream of Tartar, &c. *purging medicines*, and prohibited by his caution, as well as Scammony, Jallap, &c.^a? I hope, therefore, when the Doctor writes again, he will deal less in general absolute terms, and express himself in such a manner, that his meaning may be understood at first. Another thing I would observe is, that the Doctor tells me, I am *destitute of arguments from reason*, and, therefore, *insist on my favourite topick of authorities*; because I say, that Hippocrates, Sydenham, and Boerhaave, and all wise men that I know, except Dr Lobb, are on my side, in approving a gentle purge in the beginning of fevers, so as to clear the *primæ viæ* whenever there is occasion. How far I am attached to any authority, or claim any of my own, that is not supported by reason, is submitted to my readers; who will at least be sensible, that I quote none in praise of myself, or of my writings. This kind of authority I leave to the Doctor, who seems as fond of it as any man can be, (as we shall see by and by) and to make as much use of any kind of authority he can produce in his own favour; while, at the same time, he disregards it as much, even the authority of the same person, when it is brought against any of his opinions. The last thing I would remark, under this article, is, that the Doctor alledges, that I misrepresent him, when I quote his own authority for purging in the beginning of a fever, against his caution, *not to purge in the beginning of fevers*, &c. I beg

^a Are strong rough purges proper even at the *declination* of fevers?

leave to refer to my letter, for my quotation of the Doctor's words, to save a repetition of them here, or to his book on the small-pox^p; and if it appears, that I have misrepresented him, I will be contented to bear any censure. The Doctor says, it might be thought that I referred to one of his histories of some patient, where *he had prescribed such a strong purge, as his principles and cautions disallow.* How the Doctor came to think so, he knows best: I mentioned no case of any of the Doctor's patients. But it is a much stronger example of the Doctor's authority against himself, than cases of particular patients could be; because there might be some singularity in those patients, which might require such prescriptions. ^aIt is a general direction of the Doctor's, for purging all persons in the febrile state of the small-pox before eruption, under the circumstances ^a there specified, without a proper distinction of constitutions. And it is a direction, which may not produce so very gentle purging, in almost any constitution, as the Doctor would insinuate in his reply: it being such a dose, as should give the patient three or four stools, (he adds indeed *and no more*, as if the number was quite in his power to fix) and this after having taken both a vomit and a glyster but a few hours before; and, without any exception of the Doctor's, whether the vomit had worked downwards or not; or whether the glyster had operated much, or little, or not at all. If this general direction is not contrary to the Doctor's general caution, *not to prescribe purging medicines in the beginning of*

^p Part 1. sect. 120, 121.

^a One of these circumstances is, *if the fever proceeds nevertheless too violently.*

fevers, or before their declination, I will not take upon me to say what things are opposite.

I just mentioned a salivation in my letter, the Doctor having declared, that he thought *all venereal diseases* may be cured without it. He still owns this to be his opinion. I shall only add, that, if all the patients of that sort shall come to be convinced of the Doctor's skill in this point, it will be necessary for him, on his own account, to make known his *effectual alterative medicines* for that purpose, to as many persons, at least, as shall be wanted to assist him in that business; or else to tell the *means* by which he has acquired that knowledge, since he says, that *any other person may obtain it, if they will use the same means for it, which he has done.*

The last evacuation, which there is any question about between the Doctor and me at present, is that made by blisters. Of the Doctor's three cautions about blisters, I had taken notice only of the third, which is, *not to prescribe the application of blisters to a woman, when she has her menses flowing, except the flux is too great.* The Doctor says, the substance of my objections to this caution, are sufficiently considered in his second part, that is, in his reply to the authors of the Monthly Review; which reply was published whilst my letter was in the press. How sufficiently they have been there considered, I am contented to submit to every judicious reader. And, if that be all the answer the Doctor can give to those authors, or to me, I think it needless to enlarge upon this argument. I may, however, observe one piece of reasoning of the Doctor's against those gentlemen. They had allowed it to be rational, to dissuade the application

plication of blisters to a woman in her menses ; but add, that “ the Doctor’s approving them “ in the same, if the flux is extreme, is very “ extraordinary.” The Doctor’s answer to this is, that it *seems a natural inference from this concession, that the application of blisters to a woman, when her menses are excessive, must be proper, though not necessary.* This conclusion of the Doctor’s would be right, if it was a known and acknowledged effect of blisters to stop every hæmorrhage. But may not the stimulus, and that attenuating quality of the Cantharides upon the blood, (which even the Doctor allows upon other occasions) tend rather to promote, than to stop any flux of it ? Might not that be the reason, why those gentlemen, as well as other practitioners, choose to avoid blisters, if possible, in the natural course of the menses, for fear of disturbing the regular order of nature, and bringing on an immoderate flux, instead of *stopping that beneficial evacuation*, as the Doctor says ? And, if this should be their meaning, which surely is as probable as the sense the Doctor puts upon their words, then what becomes of the Doctor’s natural inference ? The Doctor adds, that blisters are not *necessary* in an immoderate flux, though *proper*, and that he *never does direct them in his own practice, because he knows remedies effectual to restrain it, which will give the patient no pain.* Why does the Doctor give that advice to his readers, which he never follows in his own practice ? Why does he not rather tell his own easy method, those other effectual remedies, which he himself constantly uses for this purpose ?

The Doctor, according to custom, upon almost every article, charges me with a false representation

presentation of his meaning. I refer this charge likewise, to our readers: and shall only say for myself, that if *not to apply blisters to a woman, when she has her menses flowing, except the flux is too great*, does not mean never to apply them to a woman that has her menses, but when the flux is too great, and in that case always to apply them, I do not understand the meaning of the Doctor's words.

Having so easily got rid of this argument, about the use of blisters in common uterine hæmorrhages, the Doctor resumes it in the next chapter, in defence of his practice of applying them in the bleeding sort of small-pox. He insists upon it, that this practice is right, and proves it to be so by his own authority, referring to assertions in his books, one of which is the very caution in dispute. He says, *the application of blisters in a certain degree, is a proper remedy, when hæmorrhages happen with a laxity of the vessels. This is implied in caution III.* What this certain degree is, the Doctor should have told us. We may, however, conclude, as far as three or four blisters, because he ordered four at once for one of those variolous patients, whose cases I referred to; which patient had many deep purple spots, and large hæmorrhages from the urinary, uterine, and intestinal passages: he also ordered three for the other patient, who had several purple spots, a red colouring all over his body, and a spitting of blood; and the Doctor is positive that the application was very proper in both cases. He owns, indeed, the blisters *were ineffectual in these cases*, but then, says the Doctor, they have been *evidently useful to other variolous patients*; and refers to three histories of his own, not of the bleeding

bleeding sort, but of the confluent kind, where the pustles were flat, dry, and empty, on the 10th or 11th day of the distemper. That blisters might be very proper in these three last cases, I believe every body will allow. But have such cases any the least relation to our argument, which is only about the bleeding sort of small-pox? Therefore, the Doctor might have spared his references to Dr Morton's cases, as these patients had no hæmorrhages, and also his own last section of that chapter, (though I approve of what the Doctor says in it) as nothing to the present purpose. He might also, for the same reason, have omitted the quotation from the posthumous fragments of Sir Theodore Mayerne, directing many (no less than nine) large blisters in the small-pox, whenever the patient is in great danger; but that the Doctor had a mind to have a joke with me about authority. For, as great danger may proceed from very different, and even opposite causes, so that what is a proper remedy for one kind of danger, may be a very pernicious thing in another kind of danger, in the same disease; the Doctor will grant that general precept to be absurd and dangerous, and that it was very wrong, and also injurious to the memory of that great man, to publish it to the world, as one of his rules of practice. At the same time Dr Lobb may also know, that when Sir Theodore is speaking of the means to stop an hæmorrhage, even in the small-pox, he does not mention blisters as a remedy for that purpose. But if the Doctor will still go on to prescribe blisters in the bleeding sort of small-pox, I think he must defend that practice, by better reasons

than

than any he has yet assigned, before he will prevail on any Physicians to follow his example.

We come now to the Doctor's book on the small-pox, and his vindication of Boerhaave.

As to the Doctor's notion of *curing the small-pox without it's coming to eruption*, of which he took the first hints from Boerhaave, I have said so much^r about it in my letter, that I am not willing to add any thing more on the subject. I need only refer my readers thither, and rest my appeal as I there made it. But, as the Doctor again charges me with misrepresentation, groundless banter and ridicule upon him, and with injuring Boerhaave's character, and impeaching his sincerity, I will say something in defence. The misrepresentation is, that I mention *Æthiops mineral*, as the only medicine to produce this great effect. The Doctor says, it was only one ingredient; but he allows, in his reply, that it is a principal ingredient, and in his chapter^s on this subject, he speaks of it all along as the thing he chiefly depended upon. The other medicines (except the Nitre, which he only proposes, but has never tried) joined with it seemed so trifling, that I did not think them worth mentioning. Nor does Boerhaave take notice of any ingredient but the *Æthiops*. But the Doctor can excuse an omission in him, which in me is a misrepresentation. *The notion of my own, a notion which has no foundation, and on which my banters and ridicules are grounded, is, says the Doctor, an apprehension in my mind, that he has asserted positively, that the small-pox*

^r The Doctor observes, that I employ 10 pages on this subject, but does not tell his readers, that they are in answer to 29 pages of his own. ^s Small-pox, p. 1. chap. 9.

may certainly be cured in the febrile state, and that by Æthiops mineral. How the Doctor came to charge me with an apprehension of his talking of certainty, I cannot tell, unless it was from my saying, that he had put Q. E. D. in the first edition, but had left it out in the second, and my quoting from the Doctor, that *Boerhaave thought those facts* [†] *so many proofs, that the small-pox may be cured in the manner proposed.* I did not use the word certainty, and was so far from believing any such thing, that I did not so much as allow, that the Doctor had given any proof, even of a probability of preventing the infection from taking place.

Dr Lobb is so zealous for the character of Boerhaave, as to allot one whole chapter for his vindication, against those passages in my letter, which the Doctor says, *are very injurious to his character, and an impeachment of his sincerity.* Nor can the Doctor's zeal be wondered at, since he is at the same time endeavouring to support his own character as an author. But let our readers judge, who shews the greatest regard to Boerhaave's memory, who represents him most to advantage, the Doctor or I. The Doctor must certainly value him for the fine things he says of the Doctor, and of his book. I, without any private interest, commend him, from the high esteem I have of his real merit; and represent his just and useful doctrines; in point of practice, as they come in my way; but still without thinking myself obliged to subscribe to every sentiment of his. And what do I charge him with, that should make the Doctor so warm

[†] Those facts are histories of 4 persons, who took medicines to prevent their receiving infection, though in the way of it.

in his vindication? Only an infirmity or two; nothing but an excess of complaisance in one instance, and a partiality to one of his opinions. At the same time let it be observed, how softly I censure this great man. Is it not with a *quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, if he was capable of believing such effects to proceed from such causes, and of making use of such expressions? I made the query, because the gentleman, from whom the Doctor had these anecdotes, is not quite sure that they were Boerhaave's very words, but says that his *words were not much unlike* ^u *these*.

The charge of complaisance was no more than this. I appealed in my letter to proper judges, and especially such of them as were well acquainted with Boerhaave's strong style, and his usual complaisance; whether that paragraph of a letter to Dr Mortimer (concerning Dr Lobb's book on the small-pox) which the Doctor has made such a puff with, was not rather designed as a compliment, than as a thorough approbation of the performance. The Doctor insists upon it, that Boerhaave meant literally as he wrote, and *really had that good opinion of that treatise, which his words signify*. Nevertheless, the words will not convey the same ideas, or appear in so strong a light, to those who are acquainted with Boerhaave's usual manner of speaking and writing about the characters of authors and books. I will not trouble my readers with any anecdotes on this head, but will only quote some of Boerhaave's words, as they were published by himself, in some prefaces which he wrote to new editions of several

^u Small-pox, part I. sect. 621.

books. In his preface to Prosper Alpinus's book, *de Præfagienda Vita & Morte Ægrotantium*, having named Duretus and Prosper Alpinus, he says, *Prior in immortalī mehercle scripto ad Coacā Hippocratis, posterior in absolutissimo, quod vobis jam offertur, opere, &c.* Of the *Observationes Caroli Pisonis*, he says to his students, referring to a public oration he had made before, in vastō Auctōrum numero, princeps assignatus fuit Carolo Pisoni locus: and again, *Hunc ideo virum nocturna versandum, & diurna manu commendavi vobis*: and he concludes thus, *Utamini eo (scil: libro) & fruamini, placebit & proderit; neque, certus affirmo, vel decies repetitæ lectionis vos pœnitebit.* And in his preface to Bellini *de Urinis & Pulsibus, &c.* he has these words. *Aliis enim potius, quam hoc Auctore, careat Juventus Academica*: and again afterwards, in tota disciplina medica reperiri neminem, quem jure huic præferas, vix unum forte vel alterum haberi, quem comparari illi liceat. I might quote what he has said publicly of other authors, but let these suffice to shew his manner of writing upon such occasions. Can the Doctor suppose, he intended to be always understood in the literal sense of his words? But whether he did or not, must not some of these phrases eclipse the Doctor's glory, and somewhat abate his vanity? Must they not at least make all Boerhaave's compliments to him appear more faint than they did before? And as he used to express himself in such terms about the writings of authors who had been long dead, is it any wonder, that he should say what he does of the Doctor's book; *perlegi, probavique; nam plenum vidi veræ scientiæ medicæ, promittentemque genti hu-*

manæ bona plurima; when he was writing to the ^w secretary of the Royal Society, the Doctor's brother-in-law, through whose hands he received the book as a present? Or is it strange, that he who had written so many prefaces, to the great joy and profit of booksellers, should readily give leave, when asked, to have those words of his printed, as a sort of preface, or recommendation of the Doctor's book?

And as to the partiality to his own opinion, it is so common a frailty of human nature, that all men are subject to it, more or less. Boerhaave was indeed a very great man, but he was still no more than a man, was not exempt from all infirmities and prejudices to which mankind are liable. He had a very acute and clear understanding, with a sound judgment, joined to a large compass of knowledge, of men, books, and things; a very happy memory, and an uncommon talent of setting forth a doctrine, in a clear, concise, and comprehensive manner. The two incomparable books, his Institutions, and Aphorisms, are a strong proof of this. Yet this great man, with all his excellent and uncommon qualities, was capable of prepossession, and bias, in favour of some opinions both in theory and practice; which were not likely

^w The Doctor in his reply has told us some more fine things, that Boerhaave said of him in other letters to Dr Mortimer. These I will not attempt to explain, having given so much offence to the Doctor by my sense of the former passage. As all wise men, who read Dr Lobb's writings, will form their own opinion of them, without being influenced either by Boerhaave or by me, I shall leave them to judge likewise of these extracts from Boerhaave's letters, and of the Doctor's reasons for making them public.

to wear off as he grew into years. The notion of curing the small-pox in the febrile state, so as to prevent eruption, is one instance; and I shall mention no more at present, though I could do it, because it would carry me too far. He had this thought, and published it to the world very many years (I think more than twenty) before the Doctor's book came out. It was not embraced, but, as Dr Lobb tells us, *universally condemned*, nor had he been able to establish it in all that time. At length comes the Doctor as a champion to defend the cause; and, that he may also share in the glory of the discovery, he brings some cases, which he reckons proofs of a probability of confirming Boerhaave's notion. The good old man, transported with joy, that he has at last found a second, to support him in this point before he dies, breaks out in a rapture in these words; (as the Doctor tells us) tandem in Brittanniis ortus est vir clarus, qui scripsit de variolis. Dedit ille exempla multorum * secundum hanc methodum sanatorum, nempe per Æthiopem mineralem. And again, multa ibi dedit exempla variolarum, ut ita dicam, suffocatarum per Æthiopem mineralem. What ground there is to admit those cases of the Doctor's as proofs,

* The Doctor seems very angry, that I do not allow 3 or 4 cases (if they were cures) to be *many*; and is for teaching me Grammar, telling me the meaning of multus, plus, plurimus. If I was to bring 3 or 4 cases against any of the Doctor's opinions, he would be apt to tell me the instances were not *many*, the number of them was not sufficient to conclude from. If the Doctor had never seen but 3 or 4 patients under the small-pox in all his life, whatever he might think himself, I believe every body else would reckon that he had not had *many* patients, nor much experience in that dissemper.

I have

I have sufficiently considered in my letter. Therefore I shall only add here, that Boerhaave would not have received them as such, if he had not been prejudiced in the cause: and that the Doctor would not allow such evidence, or ten times as much, to be any argument at all in favour of cures by evacuations, if those evacuations were so large as to exceed his theory. No, not even if the evidence came from Boerhaave himself. For as fond as the Doctor is of him, and jealous for his reputation, while he is applauding the Doctor and his book; yet when he speaks of large evacuations, Boerhaave is no more with the Doctor than another man. In this point he must come to the Doctor, if they are to agree in opinion, for the Doctor will not stir an inch to meet him. Accordingly the Doctor supposes, that, if ever Boerhaave had been of a different opinion about bleeding in the small-pox, he had altered his mind upon reading the Doctor's chapter on that argument; *otherwise we may well imagine he would have made some exception to it.* So that the Doctor seems to conclude, that Boerhaave approved of every tittle of his book, because he made no objection to any part of it.

The first vol. of the Doctor's on fevers, he says, I have not made many remarks upon, and that I have either brought *no objections*; or *no arguments* against what I refer to in it. I am contented, to leave this matter to our readers to judge of, and to pass on to the second vol. on fevers.

Here the Doctor undertakes to answer two of my criticisms (as he calls them) on some of his

small doses of medicines. I had said, who but the Doctor would lay any stress, or even expect any good at all, from Pulv: e Chel: ʒi. Antimon: diaphoret: Musc: Corallin: \overline{aa} gr. x. Sal: Absinth: Sal: Prunel: \overline{aa} gr ij, to be all mixed and divided into eight doses? The Doctor replies. *I need not say to men of learning, that a single grain, or a single drop, will by mixture, become diffused in a larger quantity of fluid, and produce a real effect in it, though this writer does not seem to understand it. It will be sufficient to add, that this infant (between two and three years old) happily recovered in the use of the remedies prescribed for it.* I do indeed understand, that a grain or drop of some very strong scented drugs, suppose Musk or Asa foetida, &c. may by mixture, be diffused in a large quantity of water, and produce a real effect in it as to smell and taste; but if this water should be divided into a large number of doses, I really do not understand what medical effect it could have. If the Doctor was hungry or faint, I believe he would think it poor nourishment or refreshment, if he had only water given him, with just so much food, or so much of a cordial diffused in it, as would produce no more real effect in the water, than to be just discernable to the smell and taste. That the child recovered in the use of the remedies prescribed I do not doubt; but the question is how far it recovered by the use of them. As to the other case, of curing the most profuse sweats, which had continued every night for six weeks, by one single dose of Sal: Prunel: gr. viij. Sal: Mart: gr. iij, as ignorant as the Doctor represents me to be, I can understand and believe that he cured that patient by the Bark, both of the ague and

and sweats. But I cannot allow any part of the cure to be ascribed to the single dose of this other medicine, though the sweats had continued four nights after the ague was cured by the Bark, and did not cease till the night she happened to take that dose; and though the Doctor seemed to impute the cure of the sweats to it. My remarks on the rest of the Doctor's minute doses, as also on his curing children, by applying the same medicines, his *attenuants* and *dissolvents*, nay and even *cordials* and *astringents* too, in outward forms to the surface of the body, which to other patients he gives inwardly, he chooses to pass over in silence. My next criticism (as the Doctor will have it) is on the case of the young man in a pleurisy². I refer my reader to what I have said about it in my letter. I doubted whether the case was a true pleurisy, and I still doubt it, after reading the Doctor's definition of that disease in his reply. But, taking it for granted that it was so, I submit it to every one, who is any judge in Physic, to decide this point between us: whether it was right practice to prescribe liquid Laudanum (without any evacuation so far as appears, though the Doctor cannot be positive whether he was blooded once or not) even in small doses, as 3 or 4, or 5 drops, and mixed with other medicines, to be repeated every 2 or 3 hours, or *as the pain and difficulty of breathing should require*. Is this the way to abate great heat, to bring a *strong, quick, and hard pulse* into due order, to help a *difficult breathing*, to promote the *spitting of a bloody purulent matter*? All these the Doctor allows to be symptoms of this dis-

² Second vol. on fevers, sect. 503, &c.

case, though he never told us that this young man had them all. How much Laudanum may be taken in twenty-four hours by such directions? I have said it in my letter, and, notwithstanding the Doctor's astonishment and suspicion of my sincerity, I repeat it with great truth and zeal for the good of mankind, that I tremble to think of the mischief, which such a prescription may do among the families and ignorant people, for whom the Doctor writes. We are told indeed by the Doctor in his reply, that this patient had but forty-four drops of Laudanum in four days; that is, the Doctor ordered twenty drops of it in a mixture on the first day he saw the patient, and 24 drops on the next day but one. Whether the patient had the first mixture repeated or not, in the intermediate time between the Doctor's two visits, does not appear from the history. But, if he had not, it is certain, that either his pain and fever were not very bad, or he did not follow the Doctor's direction. For he had liberty from the Doctor, to take the whole mixture in six hours at most, if the pain and fever required: and the longest time allowed to take it in was not above 12 hours. So that if it was not repeated in the Doctor's absence, and the patient took it regularly, he must have been without any medicine at all for thirty-six hours at least, if not for forty-two hours out of the first two days. However, the Doctor insists upon it, that the prescription was right, because the patient recovered. This is the conclusion he constantly makes about the remedies he uses, whether they are good, or hurtful, or ever so insignificant. But he will not admit the same argument in favour of the practice of other Physicians. He

F

will

will not allow large bleeding to be right, though multitudes have recovered, who have been blooded very freely. The Doctor goes on to defend himself against my objections, by alledging Sydenham's authority, which he supposes must be a silencing argument to me. He tells me, that Sydenham teaches me, to prescribe opiates freely in some of the most inflammatory fevers: that in a pleurisy he orders an emulsion with 3 drams of white Poppy seeds in it, and directs the whole to be drank in twenty-four hours; and that he gives opiates very freely in the small-pox and in the measles. I have a great regard for Sydenham's memory, as a wise and honest man, and an esteem for his writings; though I follow neither him nor any man implicitly, as I know of no foundation for authority in any uninspired writer, but integrity, good sense, and propriety in writing. But I do not allow that emulsion of Sydenham's to be an opiate. The narcotic quality of the Poppy lies in the milky juice, of it's leaves, stalks, and the heads which contain the seeds, and very little of it, if any at all, in the seeds themselves: for which reason, as the Doctor may observe, the College, in the new edition of the Pharmacopœia, have wisely ordered the seeds to be left out in making the Syrupus e Meconio, that the syrup may be of the greater and more certain strength; which must be uncertain before, as there happened to be more or fewer seeds in the heads. If the Doctor was to eat 3 drams of the seeds all at once, or even twice that quantity, I believe he would not be sensible of any opiate quality in them. So that the Doctor has not proved that Sydenham gave any opiate in a pleurisy. In the small-pox indeed and measles

he

he used them freely, perhaps too much so; or at least he sometimes expresses himself too strongly about them, and without such restrictions as might have been proper to make: and, I am afraid, many practitioners have been too free with them upon his recommendation. For though it must be owned, that there is a great difference between a pleurisy and the small-pox; the former being an internal inflammation, which we want to carry off by resolution, and to prevent it's coming to suppuration, as I have said at large in my letter; while the latter is an external inflammation of a particular kind in the skin, whose proper way of terminating is by a kindly suppuration: and though it will also be granted, that opiates are very useful and necessary in many cases in the small-pox; yet it cannot be denied, that in some constitutions, and in some circumstances of that disease, they may be capable of doing great mischief, and of contributing to destroy the patient, in the room of saving him; and therefore ought not to be prescribed by one universal rule to all persons alike. I will likewise mention another disease, in which Sydenham was too fond of opiates, and that is a Dysentery. I differ from him so much in this point, that it is a rule with me, to use opiates in this disease (and indeed in most fluxes) as little as possible: because I think they are only palliatives, and do nothing towards removing the cause and effecting a radical cure. Nay, so far from it, that, by locking up the morbid humours for a time, the flux returns with greater violence, attended with greater sickness and gripings, and with more fetid stools, as soon as the force of the Opium is worn off. Therefore, if I can avoid it, I do not use opiates at all, and

I have seen (in some constitutions) great success in treating this distemper without any. But when I find it necessary, I either give a dose of Opium after a vomit or a purge, to quiet the ruffle of the spirits occasioned by those operations, and to procure some rest, in order to recruit the strength of the patient; or else in a very small proportion joined with astringents, to be taken occasionally, so as not to stop, but to give a check to the flux and keep it within some bounds, when it would otherwise be too violent for the patient's strength, and likely to exhaust him before the proper means could be tried, from which a complete cure might be expected.

In the remainder of this chapter the Doctor talks of my *cavils*, of a *mistake* of mine about his sentiments, and of my making a reference to some of his sections which is *nothing to the purpose*. Of all this I shall take no further notice, but submit it to every impartial reader of the Doctor's, who will compare it with my letter, and with the Doctor's words which I there refer to.

The Doctor's book on the Stone and Gout had passed without any remarks, had it not been for those two passages, which I thought proper to quote as instances of his strong and uncommon faith in medicines, or what are called medicines, when they seem to correspond with his notions and to suit his purpose. In his reply, the Doctor charges me with *gross misrepresentations of his sentiments*, for saying that he has an extraordinary faith in some prescriptions, even though they are not his own; and for grounding it on his believing, that a man may be cured of the stone by *eating one mouthful of dry bread in a morning fasting* in a very short time, and

and on his giving credit to such idle chit-chat evidence, about the effects of the juice and decoction of Onions in curing the stone. If the Doctor does believe them, I must still reckon them examples of a very extraordinary faith. And that he does believe them, appears from the whole account of them in his book on the stone and gout, and from his reply to my letter. What the Doctor means by telling me, that *nothing is said* in the sections about bread of curing the stone, I do not well understand. He introduces the narrative by saying, he shall consider the advantages, which some persons, afflicted with the stone or gravel, have obtained by means of bread. But the evidence he brings, if it proves any thing, as he believes it does, must (I think) amount to the proof, not only of advantage, but even of a cure of the stone. Many persons had symptoms of the stone and gravel in the kidneys or bladder, who were presently relieved by the remedy of eating one mouthful of dry bread fasting every Morning; and in a short time freed from their complaints; and remained so, except that some of them at distant times had some returns, which were removed by using again the same ^a remedy. Now, as these many persons were all freed from their complaints, and we are only told that some of them had a return, may we not therefore conclude, that the rest had no return, but were effectually cured? The Doctor adds, it appears by experiments, that bread has a quality dissolvent of the stone, and that eating bread is a proper remedy ^b for persons afflicted with this distemper. As to Onions, the Doctor tells

^a Lobb on the Stone and Gout, sect. 1049, sect. 1051.

^b Ibid.

of one patient who was cured, and of others who received great benefit by Onion-water, and at last concludes, that *the relief obtained from it establishes the probability of curing the stone by Aliment*. And he further informs us, that it appears from experiments, that Onions have a *quality dissolvent of the stone*, and that it is likewise evident from one experiment, that *the decoction of Onions can well dissolve some sorts of calculi*. Yet, after all this, the Doctor will not allow, that any thing is said about curing the stone by bread, or any thing which can excuse my gross misrepresentations of his sentiments about Onions. And, for the sake of contradicting me, he does not choose, in his reply, to use the word stone or curing the stone, either by bread or Onions; but speaks of *nephritic pains, nephritic symptoms, and nephritic patients*, being greatly relieved by both. Nay, so fond is the Doctor of that word, as to use it when he refers to cases of the stone in the bladder only; which is the first time I remember to have seen that word so used. If I had applied it so, the Doctor would surely have told me, that I did not understand Greek; as he twice questions my knowing the meaning of some of the easiest words in Latin. However, it is so far lucky for me, that his most ignorant readers may understand, that by the word nephritic the Doctor means the stone in some part or other. They may observe him applying it to pain in the back, to gravel, and the stone in the bladder. The boy's case, who was cured by Onion-water,

^c Ibid. sect. 1041.
sect. 808.
809, inclusive.

^d Medic. Princ. & Caut.
^e Medic. Princ. & Caut. sect. 802, to

was doubtless the stone in the bladder, as the woman, who tells the Doctor that story, says, the boy was intended to be cut for the stone. And we are expressly told, that the gentleman who died of the stone, though he took juice of Onions, had a stone in his bladder. Therefore, I would hope, that even such readers of the Doctor's, if he will suffer them to be my readers too, may be sensible that the Doctor is in the wrong, in charging me with gross misrepresentations in this affair. And when they read in his reply, that *eating bread fasting is a proper and effectual remedy for nephritic pains and nephritic patients*; when they find him *surprized, that a remedy so frequently used, and with success, should be made the subject of my ridicule*; they may wonder the Doctor should be so angry with me for alledging, that he believes a man may be cured of the stone, *by eating one mouthful of bread in a morning fasting*: since curing the stone, (either in the kidneys or bladder) and curing nephritic complaints, must appear to them upon his own authority to be synonymous terms. What other readers may think of this matter is submitted to their judgment.

In the Doctor's answer to my remarks upon his book on painful distempers, he says, the author of the letter *has taken particular notice of this book*. But what reply has he made to that notice? The Doctor has indeed cleared himself from a charge, which I had wrongfully though very innocently imputed to him, about a quotation from Boerhaave on the proximate cause of pain. When I said, the Doctor did not quote the whole of the Aphorism, I saw Boerhaave's words were, *Si fibra nervosa cerebro orta, ita extenditur, vel alio modo disponitur,*
ut

ut dissolutionem minuetur, fit doloris idea: and I observed that Dr Lobb had quoted the passage without the words, *vel alio modo disponitur*. I had before me at the time of writing, the fourth edition of Boerhaave's Aphorisms printed in 1728, and was not aware that the words, which I thought the Doctor had omitted, were not in the former edition, nor did I know it till I saw the Doctor's reply, though I have both editions by me. This I own to be a proper answer to my remark. Whether there be any other clear and full answer, to any part of my letter, in all the Doctor's reply, is not for me, but for our readers to determine. Those words, *vel alio modo disponitur*, make a great difference in the definition, and may be so explained as to take in the whole of the Doctor's account of this matter. But I do not envy him the glory of his invention, which he is so fond of, nor the pleasure he takes in assigning nominal causes. If the Doctor likes to call the cause of pain, *too great pressure upon the extremities of the nerves, or else the immediate contact of acrid particles*, rather than with Boerhaave, "a stretching, or other disposition, of a nervous fibre, so as to threaten a dissolution," he has full liberty from me so to do. I will not enter into such a theoretical dispute with the Doctor till he shall convince me, that the settling of it can have any influence on our practice, or (as I have hinted in my letter) that it can make any difference in the cure, whether we determine the cause of pain to be stretching or pressing upon the nervous fibres. Though, if I would go into a minute disquisition of this argument, perhaps it would be no difficult matter to make it appear, that the difference between Boerhaave
and

and the Doctor in this matter lies merely in words; and that the Doctor has discovered nothing new, no ideas, which are not comprehended at least as clearly in Boerhaave's short chapter *De Dolore*, as in the Doctor's book. As to the rest of my remarks on this book, which the Doctor says I take such particular notice of, (and I did so because I thought it a matter of great importance) the only reply the Doctor vouchsafes to them is as follows. *The histories in this book are faithfully related; and the author's cavils at some of them, and his questions are of no moment to be answered: and therefore I shall not trouble myself nor my readers with a discussion of them.* This is indeed a short and easy way of getting rid of a pinching part of a controversy. But whether it is a fair, or a decent reply or not; whether it is treating an argument in a manner *becoming a gentleman, a physician, a man of candour, or a good man* (as the Doctor says) or not, I appeal to our judges. The credit of the Doctor's histories in this book, as well as his others, so far as that the patients had such and such complaints, and that they recovered, I do not dispute. I readily allow the cases to be facts, and that the Doctor has related them faithfully as they appeared to him: though I must sometimes be excused from admitting his cures for facts; when it appears, either that the disorders were so slight, that they might very well be supposed to go off of themselves, (as is often known in much worse cases than many of the Doctor's histories are) or that the remedies, he ascribes the cures to, are by no means adequate to such effects. But is it a consideration of no importance, whether bleeding or purging are ever needful in painful distem-

G

pers

pers or not, because the Doctor will not allow them to be necessary, unless there is either a *sanguine* or a *lymphatic plethora*? Is it of no moment to ask, whether no pains in the head, no inflammations of the eyes, no quinsys, no bilious colics, no nephritic disorders, &c. require bleeding? The Doctor indeed has told some cases of these distempers, and boasts that he cured them without bleeding. But many of his cases were such as evidently did not require it, as appears either from the slightness of the disorders, or the time and state of the diseases when the Doctor was first called, or other circumstances of the patients: so that nobody would have thought of bleeding in those particular cases any more than the Doctor, as I have said in my letter. Why then does the Doctor boast of curing without bleeding, where it was either quite unnecessary or even improper? If the Doctor's patients under quinsys, which were in a state of suppuration before the Doctor saw them, did well without bleeding, (which nobody would have prescribed at that time of the disease) does it follow that bleeding is never necessary in a quinsy; or that it is a question of no moment, whether bleeding is not proper at the beginning of that disease, in order to prevent the danger of a suppuration or of a mortification? Is it of no importance to ask the Doctor whether purging is never necessary in any colics, because some slight cases of them from wind, &c. may be cured or go off without it: or whether in a violent colic, proceeding from a load of hardened or acrid fœces in the bowels, we must not purge to relieve and secure the patient, till we have calculated whether he has any lymph to spare and how much, because.

because the Doctor forbids purging *when the quantity of lymph does not exceed the standard of health*, and also tells of some pains in the stomach and bowels, which he has cured without purging? Are enquiries of this sort to be called cavils and questions of no moment? The Doctor may perhaps think it of no moment to himself to answer them, or rather of moment not to answer them; but surely it concerns the health and welfare of mankind, so far as the Doctor's book can be known, to have these questions fairly and fully answered. One would suppose, the Doctor does not intend, that any of his friends should read what is written against him, but depend upon him to tell them what is right and what is wrong, what objections or questions, about any of his notions, are of moment and what are not. And indeed it is too much the Doctor's way of answering books, to pick out here and there such passages as he likes best to answer, and overlook the rest, or else to tell his readers, that they are misrepresentations and cavils, or questions of no moment to be answered. Thus, in his reply to the remarks of the authors of the Review, he takes notice of what he pleases, and omits the rest; though he is sure never to pass over any thing said in his favour, even if it means no more, than that such a passage is well enough or has nothing amiss in it. But when those gentlemen say (doubtless without any designed reflection on the Doctor, as being unacquainted with his other works) a thing which sounds more harsh, than any thing else which they or I have said in all our controversy with the Doctor, namely, that “surely
 “no Physician in his senses ever dreamed of
 “blisters being indicated in the bleeding small-

“pox, or in hæmoptœes, great hæmorrhages from the nose, uterus, &c.” the Doctor in his reply to them passes it over in silence. And when I repeat it from them in my letter, (with a proper apology for those gentlemen) still the Doctor does not think fit to take any notice of it: though at the same time, rather than own he has ever prescribed wrong, he undertakes to vindicate his free application of blisters, even in some of the most desperate cases of the bleeding small-pox, as we have seen.

I shall say nothing more about the Doctor's book on the Plague, till he has answered what I have said in my letter.

We proceed therefore to his Compendium of the Practice of Physick. Here the Doctor tells me, that *I have not made any objection to his system in general, nor to the disposition of it's parts.* It is true, for I did not intend to write a system of Physic in answer to the Doctor's system. Whether the Doctor's theories, or accounts of the causes of diseases, are *founded on hypotheses, or grounded on, and supported by the real state of things*, I shall not enquire any further, till the Doctor proves satisfactorily, what he thinks he has *already proved, that the causes of diseases assigned by him do really subsist in bodies under those diseases:* and in the mean time I shall refer to what I have said in my letter on this head. Nor shall I add any thing, to what I have there observed, about the Doctor's manner of talking of *morbid qualities* in the *blood and other fluids*, but submit that and his partial unfair way of quoting my words to the reader: to whom also I shall leave it to judge, whether I *know or believe any such thing as mor-* bid

bid qualities, which the Doctor would insinuate that I do not.

The Doctor in the next place comes to reply to what I had said about his lectures. I had observed that he proposed to teach the *whole practice of Physic*—the necessary medical knowledge—with an account of *effectual medicines* for curing the various diseases incident to human bodies, as well as other matters requisite to a right and successful manner of practising Physick: and that the Doctor said, he had been enabled so to treat on the several things relating to the practice of Physick, as to go through the whole in eight weeks, i. e. in twenty-four lectures. This I own appeared to me to be a very extraordinary undertaking; and upon the supposition that the Doctor was able to do all this, he must have been *enabled* so as never any other man was. I did not choose to enter into a grave formal argument with the Doctor, to shew that the undertaking was too great; to alledge the time and labour, that are necessary to acquire such a knowledge of these things, as other Physicians usually arrive at; or the number of lectures that are ordinarily given by other Professors, who teach Physic in a regular way, and yet do not teach the *whole* of it. For what performance is too great if a man is *enabled* accordingly? I could not therefore, upon this supposition, help congratulating all young men, who were studying Physic, on the short and easy method, by which they were to be duly qualified for practice; and even proposing some advantage to myself and all my brethren, as I presume none of us are too old to learn, or have attained such perfection in the art, but that we should still be glad to learn *effectual medicines*

cines for curing various diseases, and also many other matters requisite to a right and successful manner of practising Physic. Big with this thought, I own, I could not but smile at the imagination, of seeing the whole College gathered together around the Doctor, and attentively listening to his dictates.

The Doctor tells me, that all my *banters and ridicules* on this subject *have no foundation*; and that I have *only derided phantoms of my own making*. The foundation that I had was not only the words before quoted, but that the Doctor had also proposed, so to qualify his pupils, as that they should be *capable of passing under an ample^r examination, to the satisfaction of their examiners, and also of practising Physic in such a manner, as with the blessing of God will be happy for the sick who shall employ them.* This surely is a great undertaking; and that teacher, who can really communicate so much knowledge in so short a compass, as to *fit^r persons intending to act as Physicians, for a right and successful performance of the service*, in the space of four weeks, (to which the Doctor has now reduced his course) or even in eight weeks according to the Doctor's first plan, must without all doubt have been *enabled* in a very uncommon manner. The Doctor replies, *it cannot reasonably be concluded, that he designed or pretended to treat on all things desirous or needful to be known to an accomplished Physician*; but that he intended his lectures *for the benefit of those who have not time to go through a course of proper studies.* However he still^u owns, his design was to instruct

^r Lobb's Compend. Letter first.
Caut. sect. 204, 205.

^r Medic. Princ. &
^u Sect. 864.

so far, as to enable a man to form right notions of diseases, and of the errors to be avoided, and of the means proper for the cure of them. Whether the Doctor will please, to call a man thus qualified an accomplished Physician or not, I must leave to him: but I believe every one will allow such a man to be a good Physician. And if the Doctor only intended his lectures for such as had not time to go through a proper course of studies, how came he to invite young Physicians ^w also to become his pupils; as they must be supposed to have gone through a course of proper studies, and to have passed under an ample examination? Does not such an invitation suppose, that their education, whatever it has been before, may still be rendered more compleat by attending his lectures? And if that is the case, where is the absurdity of my imagining, that even old Physicians might become yet wiser by the Doctor's instructions; especially as he seems to pretend to *enablings*, and *secrets* from *heaven* more than any of us do, and actually professes to teach such *necessary medical knowledge*, as is not to be learned from Hippocrates, Galen, &c. to shew how to avoid errors, to treat of *effectual medicines* for curing the various disorders of the human body, and such other matters as are *requisite* to a right and successful practice? Therefore let but the Doctor make good his pretensions, and I doubt not but (as I have said in my letter) we shall all attend his next course of lectures.

The next chapter in the Doctor's reply is about bleeding women who are with child. If the Doctor had treated this subject before as he

^w See Lobb's Compend. Letter the first.

has done now, my controversy with him in my letter had been shortened, though not prevented. His doctrine is less wrong now than it was before, and yet I think it still very wrong and dangerous in it's consequences. The Doctor had laid it down in his Compendium as a general rule, that it is always *improper to take blood from a woman with child*; and that *as the quantity of the blood in a woman with child is never more than it ought to be, so the diminishing it's quantity must produce ill effects*. And he had endeavoured to impress this notion strongly on the mind of every woman, who should read his Compendium, (which, as well as his other books, is *contrived to be useful in families*) and even put words into her mouth, to say to the person that should advise bleeding for her when with child, that so she might *secure herself from being mis-managed*. This I thought one of the most erroneous and dangerous doctrines, that ever was advanced by any writer in Physic, or taught by any Professor to his pupils: though it is a doctrine so contrary to every body's experience, that I appealed to the good women to decide this part of the controversy between us. He now tells us, that it is *a general rule and a true one, that bleeding a woman with child is very improper*, but allows that *it may admit of some exceptions*. I am glad to hear of any exceptions, for his former position was absolute, that it must produce ill effects. The Doctor now grants, that a woman in the beginning of her pregnancy may have a plethora, which his former words, *never more than it ought to be*, represent as impossible. A man should be extremely careful, how he lays down general rules, especially in matters of so great consequence as this is, and

and addressed to such readers. He should consider well what exceptions they may be liable to, and what limitations are necessary to make his rules right: and the man that does thus consider, will, I believe, lay down very few absolute general rules in Physic, or at least very few that can be of any use. The judgment of a Physician lies in nicely distinguishing the circumstances of patients, in order to determine, how far such rules, as are most general, are applicable to particular cases. The Doctor goes on to tell^x us, that he *speaks of women in the progress of their pregnancy, and never intended it, as inclusive of all women in the first days, or weeks after conception: and he still thinks the opinion right of all women, after the fœtus is grown enough to take the surplus of it's mother's blood.* The Doctor should have made this distinction before; or else who could guess that this was his meaning, or that ever he would allow upon any occasion, that a woman should be blooded after she could know she was with child? So likewise, though the Doctor now pretends, that bleeding women with child is recommended by his first *principle*, of taking away blood whenever there is an excess of it, yet how could his readers possibly understand that principle to extend to this case, or imagine that the Doctor ever had such a thought, after being so expressly told by him, that pregnant women never have any excess of blood? How hard is it for the Doctor to own he has ever made a mistake? Rather than do this, he claims a privilege of explaining his words in what sense he pleases, how different so-

^x Sect 879.

ever it be from the plain meaning of them. If a man is to be indulged this liberty, there is an end of all argument, since it is hardly possible to prove he has ever been in the wrong, if he knows how to shift it, and to explain himself right at last. Whether the Doctor has been in this one instance influenced by Boerhaave's doctrine, (which I referred him to, and he has now quoted with approbation in his reply) or his opinion was the same before, he knows best. Thus far however, I think, we may conclude from his words above recited, whatever the Doctor's opinion was, that he did not, at the time of writing, think of any exceptions, that he did not advert, that there were any instances of pregnant women being plethoric, or any cases wherein it was proper to bleed them: and therefore I should hope he would allow it was right, that I happened to call for his explanation; in order to prevent his readers from understanding him in such a sense, as must (according to his present concession) lead them into dangerous practice. For though the Doctor says in his reply to me, that he writes so much on this article, *because of the vast importance of the subject, and to prevent the destructive consequences of an indiscriminate use of blood-letting among women with child*, he must allow, that in his Compendium, he had written in such a manner, as to prevent the use of bleeding them altogether. Whether the Doctor would insinuate by this, that I had said any thing in my letter, tending to favour an indiscriminate use of it in this case I cannot tell. But, if he had any meaning of this sort, I shall only refer our readers to that letter to be fully satisfied that I have not: unless by an indiscriminate use
of

of blood-letting, the Doctor means only the doing of it without a due regard to his distinction of the times of pregnancy, in which he thinks it proper or improper; for in that sense of the word I own I am for an indiscriminate use of it, whenever circumstances seem to me to require it; whereas the sense in which I disclaim an indiscriminate use of it is, that I am not for prescribing it alike in all cases and constitutions, because, while it does great good to one woman, it may do great harm to another in the same period of pregnancy; of which I have said enough in my letter. The Doctor indeed tells us, that an *excess can only subsist (even in plethoric bodies) during the very first months after conception, and that it spontaneously ceases, as soon as the fœtus is large enough to take up the surplus of it's mother's blood.* He also concludes, that if a woman has been two or three months pregnant, there is no occasion for bleeding her to remove an excess of the blood, though she is in danger of miscar-
rying. So that the Doctor seems to be still as much against bleeding after the third month of pregnancy, as he was before during the whole time. But how can the Doctor tell, that the fœtus will be grown enough by the end of the third month, to take up the surplus of it's mother's blood, or at what time it will be so grown? Will that time always be the same in all women of all constitutions? Have not some women more blood than a fœtus can ever possibly take? And may there not be indispensable reasons for bleeding after the third month, without any regard to the size of the fœtus; even

7 Sect. 897.

H 2

though,

though, according to the Doctor's fears, it should not only endanger, but actually procure abortion; if the circumstances of the case are such, that by the miscarriage the mother's life may be saved, when otherwise both mother and foetus must be lost? At least other Physicians think, that, after the third month, there may happen to be as much occasion for bleeding as before that time; that pregnant women may stand in need of it for the same reasons that other patients do, and also from some circumstances peculiar to their condition; as the Doctor may see in the aphorisms of Boerhaave, which follow those he quotes. Whether the Doctor will ever alter his mind any further or not, and come to extend his time for bleeding beyond the third month, I cannot tell. But, whether he can be convinced or not, I need not stand to prove, that women with child may be blooded safely after the third month, because every body knows it from numberless instances. And that it is not only safe, but also very expedient, and even necessary in a great many cases, all Physicians, that I know of, except Dr Lobb, are fully persuaded both from reason and daily experience. They think the true rule is, that pregnant women should be blooded at any time, when circumstances require it, when it appears to be the least evil, or that there is less hazard from doing it than from omitting it; and whether a woman has *too much blood*, or no more than the usual quantity in a state of health, or even *too little*, without any regard to the size of the foetus, in every period of pregnancy, from the time of conception to the hour of delivery.

As to the Doctor's manner of writing, which he makes the subject of a chapter, I shall
add

add but little to what I have said in my letter on this head. The Doctor says, he cannot be reckoned a *dogmatical writer*, because he assigns *reasons* and *arguments* in support of his notions. But what if some of his *reasons* and *arguments* are only such notions as need further reasons to support them, and yet the Doctor insists upon them as clear and demonstrative, and expects his readers should be convinced by them, whether they are able to see the force of them or not? However, if any proper judge, who has read all the Doctor's works, will determine against me, that I have injured him in saying, his writings have full enough of a dogmatical magisterial air, I will ask his pardon for it in any manner he pleases. Which I will also do; if the Doctor proves, that I have *said things of him which are not true* in any instance, and particularly when I *represent him as advising patients to argue with their Physicians, and teaching the patients of all the rest of the faculty to disobey their directions*. I am willing to submit this question to any impartial reader, who will compare what I say in my letter, with those parts of the Doctor's books which I refer to, and with his reply, sect. 899, &c. What is the support of this charge against me but a quibble? The Doctor pretends, that what he teaches his readers there is only to be urged against ignorant medical advisers. But if his instructions and arguments are good, will they not be applicable, and will not his readers justly understand, that they ought to apply them to Physicians too, whenever they advise bleeding and purging where the Doctor teaches that those evacuations are wrong, and should not be complied with if directed by other practitioners?

Can

Can any thing be a plainer consequence than this, that, if bleeding and purging are always improper in *cutaneous distempers*, and in all cases where the Doctor disallows of them, they must be wrong when prescribed by a Physician, as well as when advised by another person; and therefore that the Physicians advice ought to be rejected and disobeyed equally with the others? And when the Doctor bids his readers refuse to be bled or purged in cutaneous distempers, and give this reason for their refusal, that those evacuations *can no more amend the quality of their blood, than drawing off some gallons of hard or ² sour ale out of a vessel can mend what remains in it*: when he puts that expostulation against bleeding into the mouth of a woman with child, which I quoted in my letter: when he warns all his readers *not to consent ³ to an evacuation, when it is like to be pernicious to them in it's consequences*, they themselves being judges of that likelihood, by the knowledge they have received from his books: I say when these are his instructions to his readers, does he not in effect, and by the plainest consequences, both teach them to argue with their Physicians, and to disobey the directions of all the rest of the faculty, if they happen to differ from the Doctor in these points? I think, the only way for the Doctor to make good this charge against me is, by shewing that there are any Physicians besides himself, who never prescribe bleeding in cutaneous distempers, or for women with child, at least after the third month, or in any cases where his doctrine represents it as dangerous.

² Compend. Letter second.
Caut. sect. 172.

³ Medic. Princ. &

And,

And, when the Doctor has done this, I will make the proper exceptions, and acknowledge, that I ought not to have said, he teaches disobedience to all the rest of the faculty, but only that he teaches it to so many of them, as do not agree with him in opinion in these matters.

We come next to the Doctor's histories of cases, which the Doctor is pleased to make the subject of a distinct chapter, though both he and I have often had occasion to mention them in the course of our argument; and therefore can hardly treat of them separately without some repetitions. The Doctor says, I have *laboured much to discredit them, but that I have not, and cannot disprove the truth of them.* He adds, *facts are solid immutable things, like mountains, which cannot be overthrown:* and that *his histories are honest narratives of the cases related in them.* I grant that there is no arguing against facts, which we either know to be so, or find in such histories as are firmly established upon proper evidence in all their circumstances: but if any part of a story is deficient in evidence, we can never be obliged to admit the whole of it as a fact. I never doubted the truth of the Doctor's histories, so far as they are plain narratives of facts; but I have often been dissatisfied with his conclusions, drawn too hastily, from too few examples, and those not always to be admitted. Honesty is essential to good histories of the cases of patients, but judgment also is as necessary to write them properly. I allow the Doctor's histories for facts so far as that the patients had such complaints, and that they recovered; but I cannot always admit his cures for facts too, (as I have said before) because I think he often ascribes effects to insufficient causes,

ses, when he imputes the recovery of patients to such medicines, as are so trifling either in their virtue or in their doses, that they cannot reasonably be supposed to have had much, if any efficacy at all towards the cures. I have quoted some examples of this sort, and might quote more if it was necessary. The Doctor would not allow the like conclusions to be good from other people. If he would, he may hear of a thousand facts from nurses and common people (honestly related according to their judgment) of cures performed by charms, and such other things as the Doctor himself must believe to be of no efficacy. He will not admit of our cures by evacuations for facts, if they seem contrary to his notions; but reckons there must have been a plethora, either sanguine or lymphatic, in all cases where evacuations contributed towards the recovery, and that, where there was no plethora, the patients had rather a lucky escape out of our hands, than any assistance towards their recovery. I am indeed very sensible, that the Doctor and I shall never settle the affair of evacuations to our mutual satisfaction. For though I thus far agree with the Doctor, that bleeding may do infinite mischief, when directed improperly by ignorant persons, yet I appeal to all proper judges between us, whether there are not innumerable patients in inflammatory cases, (which are the principal diseases where we desire large and repeated bleedings) who suffer greatly or die for want of bleeding in time, or in a sufficient quantity, to one that is hurt by too large bleeding in the beginning of those cases. But the Doctor's histories are all facts, and he continually appeals to them as proofs of his doctrine, that all rare-
factions

factions of the blood, all fevers, painful distempers, &c. may be cured without evacuations if there be no plethora. If he tells a case or two, though ever so slight, (and truly some of his cases are so slight, that they are facts rather like mole-hills than mountains, as I have shewn in my letter) of any particular fever or painful distemper, where the patients recovered without evacuations, he boasts of them, and reckons them proofs that every disorder of that kind may be removed by the same means, unless there be a plethora accidentally joined with it; for if that happens the Doctor does bleed, though *not because* the patient *has a fever*, not as a means to cure the fever, which, depending on a morbid quality, the Doctor says may be cured without bleeding, but because he has too much blood. This argument of the Doctor's, that, because some have recovered under his care without evacuations, therefore all patients in those diseases may likewise recover without them, and consequently those evacuations are not necessary, may, as I have told him in my letter, be urged with equal strength against all his favourite medicines, and indeed against all medicines whatsoever, in order to prove that none of them are necessary: because there have been instances of patients recovering from most diseases, or at least from much worse cases than a great part of the Doctor's histories are, without any help from medicine at all.

The Doctor says, sect. 922, 923, that, *in relation to his histories of patients under fevers, I represent by far the greatest part of them (77 in number) to be in as little danger as can well be imagined in fevers of such and such denominations:*

I

and

and he cannot conceive any reason for my opinion, for I give none.—I gave no reason (as the Doctor calls it) because there wanted none, as the Doctor's own readers of his reply might have seen, if he had thought fit to quote my whole sentence. I appealed to those who are judges of diseases, referring them to the Doctor's book, and surely there was no occasion to give reasons to them. If they condemn me for saying so, I am contented to bear the shame of giving a wrong account of the Doctor's histories in that book. As for the Doctor's merry quotation from Sir John Colebatch, about expeditious cures, and keeping a patient long in hand, I am not at all concerned at it. I am for practising as far as possible by the old rule, tuto, celeriter, et jucunde^b; and I esteem him the best Physician, who has most success in this method of practice. If Dr Lobb can prove himself to be the man, I shall be ready to honour him as such: so far am I from envying him the credit of his cures, or any glory that is justly due to him. And if there are any Physicians, who designedly keep patients a long time in hand, and in continual danger of their lives, in order to enhance their own gain or apparent skill, (as seems to be insinuated in the quotation, though I hope there is not one such) they certainly ought to be accounted among the very worst of men, and as a pest of human society. For any further notice of the Doctor's histories I refer to

^b Asclepiades officium esse medici dicit, ut tuto, ut celeriter, ut jucunde curet. Id votum est: sed fere periculosa esse nimia & festinatio & voluptas solet. Cels. lib. 3. cap. 4.

my letter, and especially to the Postscript on the manner of writing cases of particular patients. I will only observe that the Doctor's remark (in a note to his 918th sect.) on a passage he cites from this postscript, by which he endeavours to fix a glaring absurdity upon me, is such a palpable cavil, that it deserves no answer. And if I was to make a circumstantial reply, to that and every the like objection and shuffle of the Doctor's, in a long formal way of assigning *reasons* and *arguments* for every proposition I advance, which the Doctor seems to require, I had need to write a very bulky volume, in the room of a small pamphlet. The Doctor concludes the note with saying, *It is sufficient to justify the publishing any history, if it may any way be useful to others.* I appeal to the public, whether I have not fully shewn in my letter, that some of the Doctor's histories cannot any way be useful to others, and therefore, according to his own argument, whether such histories ought not to have been omitted.

We come at last to the Doctor's chapter of *conclusion*. Whether the Doctor has *considered the most material things contained in my letter*, as he says, and in what manner he has considered them, I leave every able and impartial reader to judge. Let the same persons also determine, whether my letter be *a ludicrous performance, unbecoming a Gentleman, a man of candour, and a good man, unbecoming the subject, and unbecoming the profession of Physick*: and whether the Doctor or I have written most unbecomingly in

^c I obb's reply, sect. 924.

all these respects ; which of us have made the most *groundless remarks*, or been guilty of the most and the grossest *misrepresentations*. If I have in any one instance given a wrong turn to the Doctor's meaning, I can only say it was without design, and I am sorry for it. Let the Doctor clear himself as well, as to his manner of quoting my words, and his imputations to me in his reply. Let him clear himself and all his friends, from that most glaring and scandalous misrepresentation of me, published in the monthly catalogue of Books of the Gentleman's Magazine for September last, a few days after my letter came out. I appeal to every sensible and unbiassed reader, whether those remarks, on some dismembered sentences and scraps quoted from my letter, were not known to be false, and a designed perversion of my meaning, by the person that wrote them, whoever he was : whether the writer of them was not afraid of light and truth when they were against Dr Lobb, and did not manifestly intend to prejudice the readers of that monthly newspaper against my letter, in order to prevent their reading it. What reward Mr Urban had from the Doctor or his friend for publishing those remarks, and for obstinately refusing to publish a reply to them in any of his subsequent Magazines, is best known to themselves. But, as it appears that the Doctor has, either by himself or by some of his friends, such a connection^d with and influence over that monthly editor,

^d This is further evident from the flourish upon the Doctor's reply in the Magazine for March : which is written with almost as much falsehood, and imposition upon the ignorant readers of the Magazine, as the remarks on the letter to Dr Lobb in September ; and both with the same view of serving the Doctor.

one might expect that the Doctor, with all his religion, should be willing to teach him his duty as a fair compiler, and to let him know that it is but a piece of common justice, for him to be ready to publish both sides of a question. What notice will be taken of this defence by the same writer and publisher I know not. I would however advise all concerned, to have some regard to truth and justice, for their own sakes. And, if they will speak truly and fairly, let them say what they please, or what they can of it.

As to the Doctor's charge of *personal and spiteful satyr*, and of a *design to wound his reputation and prejudice his practice*, I shall defer any answer, till the Doctor either attempts, to prove me to be of a diabolical temper delighting in mischief, or to shew how I can propose any private advantage to myself by prejudicing his practice: the latter of which, at least, I am persuaded he will never undertake. I have not said any thing against the Doctor's notions or practice from hearsay, I have not dealt in anecdotes, but have quoted his own words. And if a man will scatter many vain and silly things throughout his writings, which stare him in the face when collected together; he must blame himself for publishing such things, rather than the person who points them out, whatever the consequences may happen to be.

The Doctor tells me, I have made him *the subject of my ridicule*, for his *praying and seeking to God*, and for his *acknowledging the divine blessing* to him. In this the Doctor either mistakes or misrepresents me. If I ridicule him at all on these heads, it is not for his praying to
God,

God, or his acknowledging the divine blessing, or for any thing that is truly religious, but for talking so much about his own prayers, and imputing such effects to them as cannot be granted, and for misapplying the divine blessing. Let the Doctor write pertinently about any point of Religion, and he will never be opposed, much less ridiculed by me. True Religion can never be the subject of ridicule; but a man may make himself ridiculous by talking absurdly about Religion, or by introducing and mixing it improperly with other subjects. And when this is the case, it is the man who talks in this manner that exposes Religion, (though he may do it very innocently, as having no wrong intention) not another who justly ridicules him for his absurdity. I am apt to think the Doctor himself might smile at any man, and look upon him as ridiculous, if he should attempt to confute the Doctor's *fundamental principles* by imaginary revelations and miracles, and pretend, in confirmation of his notions and practice, to a larger share of the divine blessing than the Doctor has met with. If a Physician, in his medical writings, tells us much about his prayers, and the great efficacy of them, as also that such an extraordinary portion of the divine blessing has attended his practice, as to procure him a *long and happy series of successes*, insomuch that *very few of his patients in proportion have died*; though this may be nothing more than the overflowings of devotion from a pious soul, joined with some degree of frail conceit and partiality to his own notions, yet, in the common estimation of the world, it seems to carry so much of a Pharisaical air with it, that his piety had need

to

to be well known, in order to suppose him free from all manner of worldly designs, in thus publishing his devotion and success. He may however (and doubtless he does) think, that such a view is consistent with his Religion, especially as the good of mankind is proposed as well as his own: otherwise he would have been contented to leave it to his works to praise him, to trust to his *successes* to proclaim the superior merit of his practice, and humbly to express his pious and grateful acknowledgments to God in private. But let the intention of writing in this manner be purely religious, without the least *aim at secular advantage*; let a man be ever so fully persuaded himself, that his knowledge comes from heaven in answer to his prayers, and that his success, in the practice of Physic, is owing to an extraordinary interposition in his favour, above what is granted to others; every wise man, who shall happen to read those books, (which were written for the ignorant and for the use of families) will take the freedom to judge, whether the effects are answerable to the cause they are ascribed to, whether the favours said to be granted are worthy of the supposed divine original.

If a man insinuates that an extraordinary blessing attends his prescriptions above others, he pays himself indeed a great compliment; but does he not at the same time (though not designedly) derogate from the honour of his Maker? Does he not represent the Parent of the Universe as arbitrary and partial in his favours, as granting his blessing for the sake of the Doctor more than of the patients? Besides, when we speak of the divine blessing, it should
be

be supposed that there are proper objects of it, both with regard to the patient's case and to the means that are used. For, if the case is trifling, and such as would go off without assistance, then there is no need of any means to be used, much less of any divine interposition to make them successful. And if the means used, for the recovery of a patient from any violent disease, are not proper for the case; if they have either no virtue at all, or are not equal to the proposed effect, an extraordinary divine interposition in such a case may more properly be called a miracle than a blessing. The divine blessing supposes the organs of the body in a condition to be operated upon, and that both food and medicines are to act according to their natural qualities: what is more than this is miraculous. Thus, when a cure is imputed to a charm, or any other imaginary cause which superstition dictates, as is common with the vulgar; or to something taken as a medicine but falsely so accounted; or to so small a dose of a real medicine as cannot possibly have any effect: if there is a divine interposition in any of these cases, it must perform the whole of the cure, since by the supposition there is nothing in these pretended means, that has any relation to or connection with a cure; nothing for the divine blessing to be superadded to: so that the cure must be as much a miracle, as if nothing at all had been done by man.

In like manner, if knowledge is pretended to come from heaven in answer to prayers, a wise man will consider, and examine whether there be any thing in it superior to that of other men, whether it bears any divine stamp upon it,
by

by which it may be distinguished. And if he finds no such mark, he can neither know, nor will he be easily persuaded to believe, that there is any ground for such pretensions. He will be apt to say with the Poet,

Nec Deus interfit, nisi dignus vindice nodus
Inciderit :

When *secrets* are said to be *revealed from the God of heaven*, the very terms suppose something unknown before, something worthy to be known, and which could not be known in any other way. This was the case of the Prophet Daniel, in the story from which the Doctor takes his first * Motto. Let the Doctor shew

* *There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets.* This was the Doctor's Motto to the first part of his Medical Principles and Cautions, and he has continued it in the second and third parts. In this last part he has added a second Motto designed for me, and he more than once puts me in mind of it in the course of his reply : which is, *All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them ; for this is the Law and the Prophets.* I acknowledge the obligation of this, (though I do not presume to claim any share in the first) and no man, not even the Doctor himself, desires more than I, to make it the rule of all his conduct. But I cannot apprehend, that it forbids controverting any opinions, which appear to me to be dangerous to the public, or, to use the Doctor's words, *which manifestly tend to the prejudice of the sick.* And it is plain the Doctor does not understand it to be a prohibition in this case, when he is to oppose ; if he did, he would not have been so free in censuring the opinions of some great men, as to say, that *on a review of what are called arguments for blood-letting in the cases where I think it improper, they really do not seem to deserve the name of arguments.* (Medical Princ. & Caut. Part 1. sect. 155.) because this was doing as the Doctor does not like to be done unto. Though it must be owned, that as these authors were most of them if not all dead, they could neither reply, nor have their *practice prejudiced* by the Doctor, however their *reputation or memories* may be wounded.

by his future writings that it is his case; and I will dispute with him no longer. He need not then be concerned at any attempt to ridicule his opinions; because if any author should be weak and rash enough to set about it, such a writer will be sure to expose himself, and not the Doctor. This is always the case with false ridicule: it recoils upon it's author, without at all hurting the person or the doctrine it was pointed at. So that no man, whose doctrine is reasonable and true, (whether revealed from heaven or acquired in a natural way) need to be afraid to have it brought to this touchstone to be tried; as it's purity will thereby be attested and confirmed, and the trial will reflect honour upon the author of the doctrine, and shame and confusion upon his adversaries. Therefore I apprehend, I have no occasion to ask the Doctor's pardon, for making use of ridicule in such points, as I thought would not well admit of any other kind of argument. If I have applied it wrong, the Doctor himself may readily excuse me, though I can expect nothing from the public but just censure, and to be condemned at least as a bad reasoner. Those who think the Doctor's knowledge in Physic is the effect of his prayers, that his peculiar notions are indeed *secrets revealed from the God of heaven*; that he is thereby *enabled* to instruct us all in things which we know not, and to teach all that is necessary to a *right and successful practice of Physic*, in the space of *four or even eight weeks*; that the *divine blessing* attends his prescriptions in an extraordinary manner, above those of other Physicians; and that the Doctor has *no aim at secular advantage*, no view to increase his business, by thus setting forth his extraordinary qualifications

and

and divine assistances ; I say, those who believe all these things will be sure to condemn me : and, if this should be the general judgment of the faculty, I must bear the shame of their sentence against me. I shall however, even in that case, have one consolation left, and that is a consciousness of the integrity of my intention in writing the letter to Dr Lobb ; that my real motive was to serve the public, and that if in any one instance I have misrepresented him, it proceeded merely from mistake, not from design, from a weakness in judgment, not from a bad heart. Under this support I am able to enjoy a calmness and serenity of mind, even whilst I read the Doctor's threatening of that *tremendous punishment in the next world*, which he so freely denounces against me for ridiculing his notions. I am so far from being terrified with any apprehensions of punishment on this account, that I should rather hope for a reward, for endeavouring to expose notions, which appeared to me to be errors of very dangerous consequence to mankind. And if the Doctor's religion allows him to appropriate the peculiar blessings of the Almighty to himself, and to apply God's judgments to others, nay and even to pass a final sentence on those who oppose and ridicule his notions, my Religion teaches me pity and forgiveness, in the room of anger and resentment.

The Doctor's last Section is written in a remarkable strain of piety. Whatever may be the consequences of our dispute, he *commits his reputation, and all his concerns, to the care of that good God, whose I am, (says the Doctor) and whom I desire to serve faithfully to the end of life.* This I should have no occasion to take any notice of,

of, but that the Doctor seems to set his piety in contrast with what he reckons my profaneness, that is my deriding one of the Lord's servants, namely Dr Lobb. Whether I have derided him at all, or not, and in what manner or on what account, our readers will judge: as they will also, whether the Doctor did, or did not design, by such a conclusion, to procure veneration for his piety, and to excite compassion for being derided, as well as to cast a greater odium on his antagonist. But let not the Doctor conclude, that he has more Religion than his neighbours, because they are not so ostentatious of it, or do not express themselves about it in his very terms. Another man may be as pious, may have as just a sense of his dependance upon and subjection to his Maker, though he does not introduce his Religion into all his writings, or make use of the Doctor's phrases about it. True Religion is not confined to certain forms, or particular modes of speech; but consists in a proper disposition of mind towards the Deity, and towards our fellow creatures. Wherever this disposition of mind discovers itself, and is attended with a suitable conduct, let not any one doubt of this Religion being genuine, or think, that, in order to make it so, it is necessary to be exhibited in his own form or words; as it is certain, that though men may differ in some particulars, or express themselves in a different manner, about Religion, yet if they are equally sincere, and their sentiments are equally honourable to the supreme Ruler of all things, they will be equally acceptable to him, and therefore ought to be so to one another.

F I N I S.



last end

M
N
A